

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 8, 2003, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by October 8, 2003.

Claims 15-30 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 15-17, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,265,270 to Stengel et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,339,455 A to Vogt et al. Claims 18, 19, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stengel in view of Vogt and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,369,803 A to Hirasawa et al. Claims 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stengel et al in view of Vogt et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,831,256 A to De Larminat et al. Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stengel et al in view of Vogt et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,430,609 to Van Kessel et al. Claims 24, 25, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stengel et al in view of Vogt et al and further in view of an Examiner's official notice.

The Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited reference combinations render obvious the present invention as defined in claims 15-30.

As the Examiner states in the Office Action, Stengel et al do not show several features of claim 15, such as the specific parameter to be changed in case of error free signal reception or a specific way in which to do this.

Stengel et al propose a solution according to which a better receiving mode is initiated immediately after detection of a good signal quality for a certain period of time. So, according to Stengel et al, the better receiving mode is held even if the signal quality gets worse during this period of time. After the predetermined period of time, the receiving mode is change irrespective of the signal quality (see Stengel, column 6, lines 41-52).

In contrast, claim 15 of the present application defines that the parameter of the receiver part is lowered after a predetermined time period, when the signal quality was good for that predetermined time period. Therefore, according to the present invention, a better receiving mode is initiated after a predetermined time period, when the signal quality remains good for this period of time. This avoids a premature change into the better receiving mode and improves the performance of the radio apparatus. Thus, Stengel et al do not provide any suggestion as to the invention according to claim 15.

The Vogt et al reference shows a radio receiver, which checks the signal level of the received signal. Depending on the signal lever, filter means are switched. Vogt et al disclose a radio apparatus in which at least one parameter of the receiver part is switched when a signal level exceeds a certain value. Thus, Vogt et al also fail to disclose the solution of checking the signal quality for a certain predetermined time and lowering a parameter of the receiver part when the signal quality is good for that predetermined time.

Therefore, the combination of the Stengel et al and the Vogt et al references does not lead to the present invention as defined in claim 15 of the

present application. Such a combination would lead the practitioner skilled in the art to a radio apparatus, in which a better receiving mode is initiated immediately after a good signal quality of the received signals has been determined. Furthermore, if a certain signal value is exceeded, filter means might be switched. Neither Stengel et al nor Vogt et al provide any suggestion or motivation for the practitioner to lower the at least one parameter of the receiver part in the event of error-free signal reception for a predetermined time. Thus, the present invention as defined in claim 15 is not obvious over the combination of the Stengel et al and Vogt et al references.

In this amendment, the Applicants have added new dependent claim 31, which depends from claim 15. Support for this new claim can be found in the specification on page 2, lines 2-5. New claim 31 defines that the at least one parameter of the receiver part is lowered so that energy is saved. This feature is a further difference between the present invention and Vogt et al, which only discloses changing filter means, but not lowering a receiver part parameter in order to save energy. Therefore, new claim 31 is also patentable over the Stengel and Vogt reference combination.

Likewise, dependent claims 16-30, all of which depend on claim 15, are also patentable over the cited art on the grounds argued above.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-31 are patentable over the cited reference combinations. The Applicants further request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 and reconsideration of the application as herein amended.


In light of the foregoing arguments in support of patentability, the Applicants respectfully submit that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.


Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 27 2003

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICIAL


Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700


M. E. Choussy
10/28/03